

Interview Summary	Application No. 09/852,965	Applicant(s) SNEDDON ET AL.	
	Examiner Venkataraman Balasubramanian	Art Unit 1624	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Venkataraman Balasubramanian. (3)_____.

(2) Stephen Davis. (4)_____.

Date of Interview: 04 February 2004.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 15,71 and 109.

Identification of prior art discussed: Adams et al.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

V. Balasubramanian
Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

112 first paragraph scope of enablement rejection and 103 rejection over Adams et al. made in the previous office action were discussed. Applicants proposed amendment to claims 15 and 71 to over these rejections and requested examiner's reconsideration. Applicants also indicated that claim 109 is of same scope as claim 15 and requested rejoining. Examiner pointed out that the method of use claims 123-160, as recited, if rejoined and examined, would be rejected under 112 first paragraph scope enablement for reasons of record. Examiner also acknowledged the entry of Correction of Inventorship paper filed on 7/31/2003.